

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

RAYMOND WILLIAMS, JR., #054551,
Plaintiff,

v.

LESLIE COTTEN, et al.,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL NO. 3:17-CV-0751-N-BK

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)](#) and *Special Order 3*, this *pro se* prisoner civil rights case was referred to the United States magistrate judge. For the reasons that follow, this action should be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of prosecution.

I. BACKGROUND

On March 17, 2017, the Court issued a deficiency order, requiring Plaintiff to submit a Certificate of Inmate Trust Account signed by an authorized officer and by the Plaintiff. Doc. 7. The deadline for Plaintiff's response was April 14, 2017. Plaintiff did not comply and, on April 20, 2017, the Court issued a second deficiency order. The deadline for Plaintiff's response was thereby extended to May 5, 2017. As of the date of this recommendation, however, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court's deficiency order, nor has he sought an extension of time to do so.¹ Nor has Plaintiff paid the filing fee.

¹ While Plaintiff filed a response to the magistrate judge's questionnaire on April 6, 2017, [Doc. 9](#), he has completely disregarded the Court's deficiency orders.

II. ANALYSIS


Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). “This authority flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962)).

Plaintiff has been given ample opportunity to respond to the Court’s deficiency order. He has impliedly refused or declined to do so. Therefore, this action should be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution. See [FED. R. CIV. P. 41\(b\)](#) (an involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits,” unless otherwise specified).

III. RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, it is recommended that this action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of prosecution.


SIGNED June 10, 2017.



RENEE HARRIS TOLIVER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation will be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. See [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#); [FED. R. CIV. P. 72\(b\)](#). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. See *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), modified by statute, [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).


RENEE HARRIS TOLIVER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE